15.32 hrs

Title: Further consideration of the resolution regarding review of decision to withdraw Quantitative Restrictions moved by Shri Sunil Khan on 17 August, 2001 (Negatived).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before further discussion on the Resolution regarding review of decision to withdraw quantitative restrictions moved by Shri Sunil Khan is resumed, I would like to mention that a time of one hour and 57 minutes had already been consumed out of the two hours allotted by the House for this discussion. The House is now to extend time for further discussion on the Resolution.

Is it the pleasure of the House that time for this Resolution be further extended by half-an-hour?

यदि सभा की अनुमति हो तो the time is extended by half-an-hour.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर (मइलादुतुरई) : हमें और भी टाइम चाहिये।

MR. CHAIRMAN : यह उसी समय देखा जायेगा। Now, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this extremely important discussion, which began before the Doha Conference, has been resumed after the Doha Ministerial Meeting. It is therefore incumbent on us to take into consideration what happened at Doha on the subjects of agriculture and industry.

However, the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry has laid a detailed statement on the Table of the House and I dare say that the House would wish to consider the statement in its entirety. So, without attempting to initiate here a debate on Shri Maran's statement which will, I think, be considered by this House on another occasion, I wish to confine myself to one remark that arises out of that statement and to reserve my right to return to that statement whenever a discussion on the statement as a whole is taken up by this House. That sentence is that, "the key concerns of India in agriculture have been adequately safeguarded in the Declaration."

It seems to me to be a dangerously complacent stand to take. It is true that some of our concerns have been met; it is true that we have moved forward to some extent with regard to our concerns in agriculture. But to baldly state that these interests have been adequately safeguarded appears to reflect a lack of adequate recognition of the problems that Indian agriculture and the Indian *kisan* and *kheth mazdoor* are facing.

I would be the first to admit that Shri Maran's remit, which is limited to trade questions, does not constitute the totality of the economic imperatives relating to agriculture. Most of our problems with regard to agriculture have been caused more by Shri Nitish Kumar than by Shri Maran. But I would have hoped that Shri Maran would have taken into account Shri Nitish Kumar's feelings in this respect and expressed a less than satisfied or less than smug assessment of what happened at Doha with respect to agriculture.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Shri Nitish Kumar prepared the draft.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : So, it means that you are allowing him to not only ruin domestic Indian agriculture but also our trade in agriculture. I would request Shri Maran, in whom I have far greater faith than I have in Shri Nitish Kumar, to take up his responsibilities seriously and ensure...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI RAM NAIK): He has now moved to the Ministry of Railways.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I meant the Ministry of Agriculture. Whosoever was in charge of the Ministry of Agriculture, we got his signatures and then only sent the draft to Geneva.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I am certain, Sir, that the totality of the Indian stand with respect to agriculture, as initially stated by Shri Maran in his opening statement, did have the approval and the deep involvement of the Ministry of Agriculture. I was referring to the statement made by Shri Maran at the conclusion of the Doha negotiations, where he expressed the view here on the floor of the House that 'all our interests have been "adequately" safeguarded'. I do not think they have been adequately safeguarded. They have been safeguarded more than before Doha but there still remain deep concerns and I think it is to those concerns that Shri Sunil Khan's resolution addresses itself.

First and most important is for this Government to recognise, as the House and the country have long recognised, that India's performance in agriculture in the last decade of socialism, in the eighties, was far superior to the performance of Indian agriculture in the first decade of reform. In the first five years of economic reform, there was,

up to some small extent, a certain parallelism between our performance in the eighties and our performance in the first half of the nineties. But there has been such a serious slide since then that I think that the Government, which is responsible to our *kisans,* responsible to our *khet mazdoors,* must take cognizance of this steep slippage in agricultural performance that the Indian economy has witnessed in the decade of reforms taken as a whole compared to the pre-reform decade. I do not wish to go into the details because this is not really the forum for it. But might I just flag the point that if you look at the Economic Survey for 2001 presented just before Shri Yashwant Sinha's Budget, you will find that except for jute and mestha, where the rate of growth in the nineties was marginally − 0.2 per cent or 0.3 per cent -- higher than it was in the eighties and cotton where the rate of growth in the nineties was more or less broadly parallel to the rate of growth in the eighties, in every other product, in every single other product - be it wheat, rice, pulses, oil seeds, coarse cereals, plantation crops, above all oilseeds - the production performance in the nineties as a whole has been seriously below that of the eighties. There are, of course, very many reasons for this but one of the ways in which we can enable our farmers to escape from the trap of low productivity, low income and low employment into which they have fallen in the nineties, is to have a dramatically improved performance in the export sector with adequate safeguards with regard to the import of agricultural commodities.

Unfortunately, Sir, we cannot say that the Government have performed in this manner in the trade sector in the course of the last five years since the entry into force of the Marrakesh Agreement. For example, take the raising of tariff. You bind tariffs specifically in order to have the flexibility to raise your tariffs up to the bound limit whenever it is required. Yet, in the field of edible oil, which is a field which deeply concerns the poorest farmers of India because oilseeds are by and large grown in rain-fed conditions and not in irrigated conditions, where, in the 1980s, there was an astonishing and almost miraculous situation when we changed from edible oil being the second largest import into India after crude oil, into a situation in the mid-90s when we became a net exporter of edible oil, there has been a complete reversal since then and the oilseed farmers as well as the oilseed crushing industry have suffered serious reversal. While all this has been going on, there has been such a massive increase in imports of edible oil that this Government should have acted much in advance in raising tariffs of edible oil imports to protect the interest of Indian oilseed farmers and the Indian oilseed crushing industry. It completely failed to do so. It was very tardy. They have now raised it to 60 per cent on everything except soya bean oil. This is a step that could have easily been taken three years ago or four years ago. But they did not do it, with the result that there has been a very serious adverse impact upon our oilseed farmers as also the associated industries.

s.15.42 hr (Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya *in the Chair*)

I would like to quote a few lines from an article by C.H. Hanumantha Rao, former member of the Planning Commission, in this regard where he says:

> "Despite high tariff binding at 300 per cent, it is due to the failure of market intelligence, lack of alertness and inability to act promptly to raise import duties that we have had this massive increase in imports of edible oil. "

He quotes in this regard both the articles by Chand of 2000 as well as by Ashok Gulati of 2001.

Then, there was inadequate use of other types of safeguards available to us. In bilateral diplomacy, for the bilateral agreement under the overall umbrella WTO agreement, poor diplomacy and a dangerously poor understanding of Indian interests, combined with weak-kneed submission to outside pressure, has resulted in many bilateral agreements, including the one signed with the United States of America, not adequately meeting Indian interests, and bringing forward compliance dates without taking the full time permitted to make the necessary domestic adjustments.

Then, Sir, the Government have been targeting our subsidies instead of targeting the subsidies that are given in the developed countries who are preventing us from finding markets there while opening up our market to invasion from outside.

Finally, there has been an inadequate assault by our diplomacy on the kinds of pressures that are brought to bear upon us in institutions like WTO. Is it not a very saddening fact that the Prime Minister of India should have been received in the White House just a week before Doha, and, to the best of public knowledge he has not raised any of the significant issues which Shri Maran raised at the start of the WTO Conference? Should we not be protecting our interests? When the Government of India had pledged itself to the United States of America for isolating Osama Bin Laden, the US Trade Representative was putting all the pressure possible on all our friends in the developing countries to isolate Shri Murasoli Maran at Doha. Is this the way in which foreign policy should be synergised with foreign economic policy?

Sir, it is essential in the area of trade that over the next 2-3 years that we have, before we come to a revised Agreement on Agriculture, there be a very focussed and very targeted attack by not only Shri Maran but also by

Shri Jaswant Singh preferably with the support of the Prime Minister, to bring to the attention of the world, to bring to the attention of the developing countries, to bring to the attention of the developed countries, and specifically to bring to the attention of the United States of America, our deep concerns in this regard.

Thus, for example, there is nothing at the moment which shows recognition of what is the share of agriculture in a country's GDP or the share of agriculture in a country's total employment structure. In India approximately 30 per cent of our GDP comes from agriculture and approximately 70 per cent of our population is engaged in agriculture. How does this compare with the developed world? According to the World Bank Report of 2000, where 30 per cent of India's GDP comes from agriculture, in Germany only one per cent of their GDP comes from agriculture. In the United Kingdom, in the USA and in France, it is just two per cent. With regard to employment, where 70 per cent of our people are employed in the rural sector, in Germany and United Kingdom, only three per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture; in the USA only four per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture and in France only six per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture. With merely two to three per cent of GDP arising out of agriculture and merely two to six per cent of the population engaged in agriculture, look at the massive subsidies that are given to agriculture in the developed countries.

According to Ashok Gulati's estimates, the Producers Support Estimate, PSE, support to agriculture in the European Union is 44 per cent; in Japan it is 61 per cent; in the Republic of Korea it is 65 per cent; in Norway it is 66 per cent; and in Switzerland it is 70 per cent. What is it in India? For product specific subsidies it is minus 38.5 per cent; and for non-product specific subsidies it is 7.5 per cent.

So, here we are in a curious situation where at the urging of the World Bank, the Finance Minister of India keeps returning to this House to tell us to reduce subsidies as a way of arriving at the macro - economic balance, and neither Shri Jaswant Singh nor the Prime Minister of India goes to these developed countries and says they are the sinners; we are only imitating them and therefore we must have the right to increase our subsidies to whatever level is required for the protection of Indian farmers, and at the same time, it is absolutely imperative that all the developed countries reduce these ridiculously high trade - distorting subsidies which they are giving themselves.

Yet, that is not being done. All we hear is the still small voice of Shri Murasoli Maran. The rest of his Government does not support him. According to newspaper reports, the rest of the Government even slapped him on his knuckles while he was in Doha. What would have been an outstanding performance had there been a DMK Government sitting in Delhi was reduced to what it was, there being an NDA Government sitting in Delhi. I feel very sorry for Shri Maran.

सभापति महोदय : मणिशंकर जी, मैं आपको रोकना नहीं चाहता था, आप बहुत अच्छा बोल रहे हैं, लेकिन इसका स्टैण्डर्ड टाइम 4.05 बजे खत्म हो जायेगा। अभी एक माननीय सदस्य को बोलना है और माननीय मंत्री जी को इसका उत्तर भी देना होगा। यदि आप संक्षेप में बोलकर खत्म कर दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर : मैं कोशिश करता हूं, लेकिन आपके यहां पधारने के पहले रघुवंश प्रसाद जी ने हमसे कहा था कि आधा घंटा खत्म होने पर यदि सदन चाहे तो इसमें और विलम्ब किया जा सकता है और हम एक घंटे तक तो जा सकते हैं। मैं आपकी आज्ञा मानता हूं कि जितने संक्षेप में मैं कह सकता हूं, मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा।

With regard to aggregate agricultural subsidies, just consider the position. The total Indian agricultural output is valued at some 90 billion dollars. But, in the United States, subsidies to agriculture − I am not talking about the value of their output − are 128 billion dollars, which is higher than the total value of India's agricultural output.

And in the developed countries as a whole, the total subsidy given is in the region of 325 billion dollars. How can our agriculturists or food processors export to these developed countries? Yet, it is the same developed countries which keep lecturing us about how trade liberalisation, arising out of the comparative advantage theories of David Ricardo written in 1817, is going to benefit us. If trade liberalisation in industry and services is going to be of such great benefit to the developing countries, then surely, by the same logic, trade liberalisation in agriculture which is fundamentally a question of developed countries reducing their subsidies and tariffs, should be of benefit to the developed countries. But unfortunately, when Shri Maran makes this technical argument at Doha in an economic forum, there is no political backing being given to him from the South Block. Now, when you consider that at the time when there was a synergy between foreign policy and foreign economic policy, when the Congress Party was in power, after all, if there had been no NAM, how could there have been a Group of 77? Just consider that we brought the Third World together on a political form and that is what enabled us to create a Third World grouping for economic purposes. Those economic purposes were reflected in Part-IV of GATT. When we signed GATT as a founder - member in 1948, there was no provision for special and differential measures in favour of developing countries, but it was India which took the lead under the leadership of great civil servants like Shri L.K. Jha and Shri K.B. Lal. It was at a time when people like Shri T.T. Krishnamachari were in charge of Commerce and Industry here. We took the lead in compelling the developed countries to give legal recognition to special and differential measures which are embodied in Part-IV of GATT. All that Shri Maran has been able to obtain is − he is a poor man fighting the battle on his own without adequate backing from the rest of his Government − to get them to piously state that they are in favour of special and differential measures but not to give legal recognition to this. What is

worse, all kinds of exemptions are being sought, largely by developing countries even if a few developing countries are doing the same, of putting in requests for exemption from trade liberalisation in agriculture in what are called the blue and green boxes.

When it comes to tariffs, if you think that we are protecting ourselves excessively with 300 per cent binding on edible oils other than soyabean oil, just consider the case of peanuts. Do you know what is the tariff in the United States for groundnuts? It is 174 per cent! It is 174 per cent for groundnuts for the richest country in the world and we accept this as fair and just! As regards wheat, we have got huge stocks lying here. There should be a possibility of India being a major exporter of wheat and wheat products. In the European Union, the tariff is 168 per cent and in Japan it is 353 per cent on wheat in a rice -growing and rice - eating country. And we are saying that we have to liberalise trade and bring down tariffs. On butter, in Canada, the rate of tariff is 360 per cent. And here, the milk products are coming into India free of tariffs! There has been no protection for us. So, it is extremely important to recognise that if international trade in WTO is going to be based on Ricardo's principles of comparative advantage, then, as per the definition of comparative advantage given in David Ricardo's book, which was called "The Principles of Political Economy" in 1817, there was no reference to subsidies or taxes. His understanding of comparative advantage was in the absence of taxes and subsidies. In the real world, the world with which Shri Maran has to deal, there is nothing but taxes and subsidies, to be seen particularly in the developed countries.

All that we have been able to progress towards is, with the multiplicity of these multi-coloured boxes, somewhere blue and somewhere green, while we have been pressurised to dismantle our public health system in the interest of a few U.S. producers, neither the External Affairs Minister nor the Prime Minister of India is assisting the Commerce and Industry Minister. ESCAP, in 1995, estimated that the welfare gains of complete liberalisation, including textiles, for developing countries could be two and half a times the welfare gains to be obtained through agricultural globalisation alone. Yet, we do not find any progress in matters of particular interest to us in the industrial sphere or in the agricultural sphere. Apart from procrastination, we have not secured any real commitment that would help us to protect the Indian farmer in the Indian market and promote his interest in the global market. In these circumstances, for Shri Murasoli Maran to say that the key concerns of India in agriculture have been adequately safeguarded, appears to me to not reflect the true interests of our country. I hope that by a passionate intervention today, he can assure us as − neither the External Affairs Minister nor the Prime Minister is present and all his supporters are sitting here in the Opposition benches, that we will hear from him once again, that voice which he raised in Doha at the beginning and not the whimper that we heard at the end. There is no point in a dog barking if when the watchman comes out, it puts its tail between its legs and retreats. We expect Shri Murasoli Maran's bark at Doha to become the roar of a tiger, (but not of the liberation tigers) on behalf of the developing countries, because he has shown that he alone has the courage to stand up for India's interests and not submit to the Americans as every one of his colleagues is doing. Therefore, I call upon Shri Murasoli Maran to please speak for the Indian *kisan* and *kheth mazdoor* when he replies to this debate.

Sir, I regret that I have not had the opportunity to deal with the second half of Shri Sunil Khan's Resolution which is with regard to industry. With your permission, I would like to add just one sentence so as to be able to complete my intervention. It is that small and medium industries have been gravely damaged by the very slow action taken on legitimate anti-dumping measures and imposing countervailing duties. We hope, Sir, now, with your new anti-dumping machinery, we will see much quicker action on your part. Our only hope of seeing quick action is from you. In a Sinha-driven Government or Jaswant-driven Government, there is no hope at all because they receive their orders from the White House. But you receive your orders, I hope, from the people of India.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : सभापति महोदय, श्री सुनील खां जी ने बड़ा जनहित वाला संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है और यह देश हित में है। इस पर सरकार गंभीरता से विचार नहीं करे,, उसे मान ले तो देश का कल्याण होगा। अभी देश भर में हर जगह बहस चल रही है और डबल्यूटीओ का कु-प्रभाव बढ़ा है जिससे सभी लोग चिंतित हैं, खासकर किसान और गरीब आदमी बहुत चिंतित है। 'गैट' जनरल एग्रीमेंट ऑन ट्रेड एंड टैरिफ पहले हुआ था, फिर डंकन प्रस्ताव आया उससे देश भर में हंगामा हुआ और फिर मंत्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज और डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी, इन दोनों ने डंका पीटकर डंकन के खिलाफ किया और अभी चुप्पी साधे हैं और छटपटा रहे हैं।

16.00 hrs.

दोहा में हुई कान्फ्रेंस के बारे में विद्वान सदस्य, मणिशंकर अय्यर जी, ने अपनी बात कही है। दोहा पर तो अलग बहस होगी। वैसे माननीय मंत्री जी ने दोहा जाने से पहले विपक्षी सदस्यों से परामर्श किया था, लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि देश हित में खतरा अभी भी है। वहां प्रस्ताव में एग्रीकल्चर जोड़ दिया, एक्सैस बाजार जोड़ जोड़ दिया। उसके बाद TRIPS, TRIMS & GATT आदि पांच खण्ड जोड़ दिए, जिसका बड़ा भारी दूप्रभाव और कुप्रभाव हो रहा है। महोदय, इस विाय पर धन्टों बहस हो सकती है, क्योंकि यह जनहित का विाय है। यह ठीक है कि सदन की राय से दो घन्टे का समय निश्चित किया है।

सभापति महोदय : इस संकल्प पर चर्चा का समय 16.05 बजे तक है। यदि माननीय सदस्यों की सहमति हो, तो आधे घन्टे का समय और बढ़ा दिया जाए, ताकि रघुवंश प्रसाद जी अपनी बात कह सकें और माननीय मंत्री जी उत्तर दे सकें तथा साथ ही श्री सुनील खां जी को अपनी बात कहने का अवसर मिल सके। इसलिए इस संकल्प पर चर्चा का समय आधे घन्टे और बढ़ा दिया जाए।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : यह संकल्प जनहित में है और प्रासंगिक है। वहां मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध कर दिया। पहली खेप मं 714 और दूसरी खेप में 715, कुल 1429 सामानों की लिखा-पढ़ी हो गई है और दस्तखत हो गए। अब माल बाहर से आएगा और कोई मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध नहीं हेगा। इसमें कोई रोक-टोक की गुंजाइश नहीं है।

जब डंकल का प्रस्ताव आया था, तो छोटे-छोटे जो विकसित देश थे, उनके बाजार में सामान सैटुरेटेड हो गया और अब कोई खरीददार नहीं है, इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान में बाजार की खोज कर रहे हैं। सौ करोड़ वाला देश मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध हटा, तो धड़ाधड़ बाहर से सामान आएगा। फर्ज कीजिए, किसी मुल्क की आबादी एक करोड़ की है और टीवी उत्पादन करने वाले देश एक करोड़ का उत्पादन करते हैं, तो हर घर में एक टीवी हो जाएगा। उसके बाद फिर कारखाना बन्द करना पड़ेगा। फिर हिन्दुस्तान के बाजार की तरफ बढ़ो, फिर मंत्री महोदय को जाकर कहना चाहिए कि जनरल एग्रीमेंट में सर्विस का आदान-प्रदान होना चाहिए। इसके भी केवल आधुनिक सेवाओं में आदान-प्रदान नहीं होना चाहिए। आने-जाने के लिए पासपोर्ट तरफ बढ़ो, फिर मंत्री महोदय को जाकर कहना चाहिए कि जनरल एग्रीमेंट में सर्विस का आदान-प्रदान होना चाहिए। इसके भी केवल आधुनिक सेवाओं में आदान-प्रदान नहीं होना चाहिए। आने-जाने के लिए पासपोर्ट को फ्री कर दीजिए। हम लोग तैयार है, हमारे लोग मेहनत करके अपना काम करेंगे। चूंकि, हिन्दुस्तान आधुनिक सेवाओं में पीछे हैं, अन्य विकासशील देश पीछे हैं, आधुनिक सेवाओं में विकसित मूल्क के लोग आयेंगे, यह बहुत ही खतरनाक स्थिति है। हमारे यहां के वकील, यहां के डाक्टर और मजदूर बाहर नहीं जा सकेंगे। वे यहीं रह जायेंगे और उनके होशियार लोग यहां चले आयेंगे। जब इसके इम्पलीकेशन पर विचार होगा, तो भविय अंधकारमय नजर आता है।

आज तेल-उत्पादक किसान मर रहा है। अब उस पर मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध खत्म हो गया। अय्यर साहब हिसाब जोड़ कर बता रहे थे कि विकासित मुल्कों में एग्रीकल्चर के क्षेत्र में करोड़ों-अरबों की सब्सिडी दी जाती है है, किसानों की मदद की जाती है। सब्सिडी के द्वारा मदद पाया हुआ किसान जो उत्पादन करेगा, उससे एक्सपोर्ट की भी सब्सिडी धड़ाधड़ यहां आएगी।

महोदय, अब सुना गया है कि मुर्गी की टांग में ज्यादा स्वाद है। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग कहते हैं कि मुर्गी की टांग बड़ी स्वादिट होती है, लेकिन अमेरिका में लोग इसे नहीं खाते। वे कहते हैं कि इसमें फैट है। इसे वे नहीं खाते और जो पांच-दस वर्षों से फ्रिज में ठंडे में रखा हुआ है। अब वे उसे कहां फेंके - वे कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान भेज देंगे। अगर वे हिन्दुस्तान में भेजेंगे तो यहां के मुर्गी पालक किसान क्या करेंगे। उसे वहां से सस्ता भेजा जाएगा क्योंकि उनके यहां तो बेकार पड़ा हुआ है लेकिन यहां के लोगों को वही स्वादिट लगता है। वे अगर यहां भेजेंगे तो वह हिन्दुस्तान के बाजार में बिक जाएगा और यहां की मुर्गी को कोई नहीं पूछेगा, जब कि यहां की मुर्गी का स्वाद सबसे अच्छा होता है। अंडे को भी सब लोग बढ़िया मानते हैं, लेकिन जब सस्ता पदार्थ हिन्दुस्तान में आ जाएगा तो यहां के किसान मर जाएंगे। इनका मात्रात्मक प्रतिबंध खत्म हो गया, जिसे ये रोक नहीं पाए हैं। ये दस्तखत कर चुके हैं। माननीय मॉरन साहब कहते हैं कि यह असेंशियल है, अनिवार्य है - खराबी यही है और इससे बचने का उपाय कर रहे हैं, लेकिन इनकी खराबी से हिन्दुस्तान कैसे बचेगा - यह चिन्ता का विाय है। इसी में सारी तरकीब और बुद्दि, डिप्लोमेसी लगनी चाहिए। सब विकासशील मुल्क एक जुट हों। इसमें गहन छानबीन और मेहनत करने की जरूरत है, नहीं तो हिन्दुस्तान और किसानों का भविय खतरे में है।

अब हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया में सबसे ज्यादा दूध पैदा करने वाला मुल्क हो गया है और अमेरिका को भी हम लोगों ने पिछाड़ दिया। अब वे 78 मिलियन टन से बढ़कर 79-80 मिलियन टन उत्पादन पर पहुंचे हैं। अमेरिका पीछे छूट गया है। पिछले साल हम उसकी बराबरी पर आए थे। अब यहां दूध वाला पाउडर, दूध से बना दही और अन्य पदार्थ, सब आने की छूट हो गई। इन लोगों ने दस्तखत कर दिए। हमारे यहां अभी तक अनुसंधान चल रहे हैं। दूध दो-तीन रोज में खराब होने लगता है और वहां से पॉश्चुराइज़्ड मिल्क वे भेजेंगे, जो तीन महीने तक खराब नहीं होगा। वहां से पाउडर का बनाया हुआ, प्लास्टिक पैकेट में भरा हुआ दूध आ रहा है। हमने बाजार में सेब देखा, उस पर वाशिंगटन लिखा हुआ था। â€¦ (व्यवधान) मैंने अपने एक जानकार आदमी से पूछा कि क्या वांशिगटन में सेब नहीं होता, जो इस पर वांशिगटन लिख दिया है।â€¦ (व्यवधान) हिन्दुस्तान में बाहर से सेब आ रहा है। आटा, सत्तू, नमक, हल्दी आदि बाहर से आएगी। सब के लिए दस्तखत हो गया, सब आइटम्स को कृपा कर पढ़ा जाए।â€¦ (व्यवधान) अब चीन और WTO में दस्तखत किया है।â€¦ (व्यवधान) आप दिल्ली के चांदनी चौक बाजार में जाकर देखें। महाराट्र में गणेश चतुर्थी की पूजा होती है। यहां गणेश की मूर्ति का दाम 500 रुपए है और चीनी लोग जो मूर्ति बना कर भेज रहे हैं, उसका दाम 85 रुपए है। चीनी लोगों ने वहां गणेश जी की मूर्ति बना कर भेज दी।

बिजली की लड़ियां या झालर जो दीवाली पर घरों में टांगते हैं या जो बिजली के फानूस होते हैं भारत में बने फानूस या झालर की कीमत 2000 रुपया है और चीन में बनी की कीमत केवल 500 रुपया है। इस तरह से यहां के छोटे-छोटे उद्योग मर रहे हैं। इसी तरह से गांव में किसान को समर्थन मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा है। उसकी लागत बढ़ रही है और खेत में लगने वाली चीजों का, बिजली का, सिंचाई का खर्चा बढ़ रहा है सब्सिडी घट रही है। प्लांट पैस्टीसाइट्स की कीमतें बढ़ रही हैं। यही कारण है कि किसान आत्महत्या करने पर मजबूर हो रहे हैं। सरकार के पास उनकी रक्षा का उपाय नहीं है। अगर वह कहती है कि डब्ल्यूटीओ के कारण किसान की हालत खराब नहीं हुई है तो वह बताए कि किस के कारण आज किसान भूखमरी के कगार पर पहुंचा है। नीतीश कुमार जी आ गये हैं। डंकल पर कितना खिलाफ भाष ाण कर रहे थे। आज भारत के किसान, मजदूर सब परेशान हैं। डब्ल्यूटीओ की मीटिंग जो दोहा में हुई वहां ये हस्ताक्षर करके आये हैं। अब पता नहीं दुबारा कब मीटिंग होगी। लेकिन जब भी मीटिंग हो तो सरकार इस संकल्प के साथ वहां जाए या हमारे प्रतिनिधि वहां जाएं कि हम दुनिया में 100 करोड़ भारतवासी हैं और दुनिया के 16 प्रतिशत लोग हैं और डब्ल्यूटीओ की जो किसान विरोधी, मजदूर विरोधी बातें हैं उनको ध्वस्त करने की आज जरूरत है। जो कानून गरीबों के लिए, किसानों और मजदूरों के लिए खराब हैं उनको तोड़ने की जरूरत है।

भारत में आज मानसिक गरीबी भी काम कर रही है। डब्ल्यूटीओ को करारा जवाब देना चाहिए था। डब्ल्यूटीओ से अगर भारत हट जाएगा तो क्या डब्ल्यूटीओ चल पाएगा, नहीं चल पाएगा। हम दुनिया के 16 प्रतिशत लोग हैं और हमारे यहां सारा सामान पैदा होता है। इसलिए यह जो क्वान्टेटिव रिस्ट्रिक्शन के विड्राल से सरकार में कमजोरी आ गयी है उस कमजोरी को दूर किया जाए। दस-बीस प्रतिशत आयात शुल्क लगता है लेकिन यहां तो हर तरह का सामान आ रहा है। सरकार बताए कि कितना आयात शुल्क सब पर लगा है। हमारे यहां के किसान और छोटे धंधा करने वाले लोगों का व्यापार आज सुरक्षित नहीं है। सदन को चिंता है। इसलिए सरकार मजबूती से खड़ी होकर आगे दस्तखत करने से पहले इन सब चीजों को देखे। हमें डब्ल्यूटीओ के दुप्रभाव से हिंदुस्तान को बचाना होगा। नहीं तो हम उनकी चाल में बुरी तरह से फंस जाएंगे। इसीलिए मैं सरकार को सावधान कर रहा हूं। जो बहस आगे हो उसमें सभी विकासशील देशों को मिलकर विकसित देशों से अपने हितों के लिए लड़ना होगा। ऐसा मेरा मानना है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी (देवरिया) : सभापति जी, अभी-अभी हम लोग जर्मनी में एक कांफ्रेंस में थे और आज सवेरे ही लौटे हैं। माननीय मणिशंकर अय्यर जी भी उस कांफ्रेंस में थे। उस कांफ्रेंस में और भी बहुत से लोग थे जिन्होंने दोहा कांफ्रेंस में भाग लिया - मार्टिन कोर थे, फ्रांस से मिस्टर लाम्बी थे और इस विाय पर भी वहां चर्चा हुई ,काफी चर्चा हुई और ऐसी जगह चर्चा हुई जो तटस्थ स्थल है। कुछ लोग उसके साथ थे, कुछ उसके खिलाफ थे। मणिशंकर जी ने जो बात कही मैं उससे ज्यादातर सहमत हूं लेकिन जो निर्का उन्होंने निकाला, उससे इस समय सहमत बिल्कुल नहीं हूं। निर्का केवल एक है कि अगर उतनी रीढ़ की हड्डी हम गैट एग्रीमैंट के समय दिखाते जितनी रीढ़ की हड्डी मुरासोली मारन जी ने इस कांफ्रेंस में दिखायी है तो अच्छा होता। जिस ने भी बात की, उसने हिन्दुस्तान की सराहना की। थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज की सराहना की और इनका नाम बार-बार आया इसलिए मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार हूं कि जितना हम लोग चाहते थे सम्भवतः उतना नहीं हुआ लेकिन इसमें देखने की जरूरत है कि इसकी क्या वजह है? वजह केवल एक है कि व्यवस्था इस तरह की इस समय है कि थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज की आवाज पूरे तौर पर वहां सुनाई नहीं पड़ रही थी। हमें यहां तक बताया गया कि आखिर में चेयरमैन खड़े होकर कहते हैं कि भारत के कहने पर मैं इस बात से सहमत हूं कि कोई नया एजेंडा बिना आम सहमति के बनाया न जाए। यह तटस्थ लोगों ने बताया, मार्टिन खोर ने बताया। वह चीज यहां उसमें नहीं डाली गई। इसलिए इन चीजों से बचने के लिए इसका निर्का यह है कि हमें व्यवस्था में बदलाव लाना पड़ेगा, अपने रिप्रेजेंटेशन को बढ़ाना पड़ेगा और तरीके निकालने होंगे। â€¦ (व्यवधान) मैं एक मिनट लूंगा। यह बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि हम दिशा भ्रम में जा रहे हैं और केवल सरकार की आलोचना में जा रहे हैं। हमें यह चीज याद रखनी है कि सिंगापुर में हमने कहा कि हमें व्यवस्था में बदलावा लाना है। जो हमारे खिलाफ थे, जो तटस्थ थे, एक स्वर से सब ने बताया और उस कांफ्रेंस के दौरान मुरासोली मारन जी की प्रशंसा की। मैं यह बात बहुत अच्छी तरह से कहना चाहता हूं। मेरे ख्याल में इससे मणिशंकर जी भी सहमत होंगे।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अखबारों में आया है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी दबाव डाल रहे थे कड़ाई से न करिए। â€¦ (व्यवधान)

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : जितना इन्होंने कहा है उतना आज तक किसी ने नहीं कहा। इतना ही मुझे कहना था।

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Mr. Chairman Sir, I am grateful to hon. Member Shri Sunil Khan for having focused an important issue and I will congratulate all the hon. Members and thank them for the contributions they have made.

But today, the hon. Member and my brother Thiru Mani Shankar Aiyer and Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh"s - driven discussion have turned around agriculture and WTO, therefore, I would like to take it up first.

In the Doha Declaration, if there is one paragraph which is giving the most comfort to India and developing countries, it is with regard to agriculture because AOA, (Agreement on Agriculture) has come into effect from 1995 after Uruguay Round. Therefore, it is the seventh year of its implementation and so far no adverse effects have taken place. You know the Uruguay Round was signed by the Congress Government and the credit goes to them. We have signed it in good faith. We expected liberalisation of agriculture would open up our agriculture market to international market and we can compete successfully with those other countries.

The hon. Member, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was correct that the subsidies given by the European Union and the other OECD countries are so huge that we could not compete with them. His figures are correct. For example, I would put it in a different manner. The subsidies given by the OECD countries is equivalent to the entire GDP of all the African countries combined together. That is why, the international prices are so low and we could not compete. So, what have we gained in Doha?

According to the Agreement on Agriculture from 2000 negotiations are going on. That is for further liberalisation. But the European and other vested interests are saying, 'Okay, let us continue to discuss. It is open-ended. There is no time frame when it should end.' Therefore, all the Developing Countries and Cairns Group also were fighting. We should fix up the time limit. That is why, what we have gained in Doha was a paragraph, which is article 20 plus i.e. further liberalisation. What we have achieved was this: Now, it is stated that they would reduce and phase out their agricultural subsidy. So, it is a great achievement for all the developing countries, and at the same time, we have to protect our interests. What are our interests? Our interests are food security and rural development. I would say with all happiness that for the first time, food security has entered into the lexicon of WTO. It is a success for all Indian farmers but at the same time, as Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said, we have to improve our agriculture, we have to increase our productivity, and we should be able to take the opportunities because this Doha Declaration will be effective from the year 2005. So, during the interregnum of five years, we have to negotiate, negotiate hard, and win laurels for our agriculturists. I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. He has said that we are all worrying about industrial tariff and its reduction but not this tariff. We have been worried, in the sense, hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee had gone on record saying, 'India played a bigger role in bringing agriculture into the discipline of WTO'.

That is a fact. It is estimated by some economists that every one per cent which will divert - terms of trade - about Rs. 8,500 crore additionality in favour of agriculture, and that about 20 billion dollars, that means over Rs. 60,000 crore will be transferred to the agriculture sector from the non-agriculture sector in the next few years, provided we internationalise our agriculture, provided we establish links with the international market. So, there need be no worry.

The Agreement had come into being from 1954. Even in 1995, when Shri Pranab Mukherjee participated on behalf of India, they had assured us, and still that assurance holds good because nothing had happened. So, they cannot touch our Public Distribution System, they cannot ask us to reduce our subsidy. So, our marginal farmers will be taken care of. Still we made a rough calculation, that is we can increase our subsidy to the extent of Rs. 42,000 crore provided the Government has money. So, WTO does not come in the way, it will not, so far. The question is, how to raise the revenue. Therefore, I would say that there are problems in agriculture but they are not because of WTO but in spite of WTO, which I want to point out.

Dr. Raghvansh Prasad Singh has said about movement of persons. I agree with him, that is mandated negotiation for review of services, which is going on in Geneva. There, we have stressed the point, 'movement of persons'. Those who are service-providers should move freely. The services negotiations are going on. I remember the Editorial in *The Guardian* some time back − 'a can of beans or a can of worms can travel all over the world but a person cannot travel'. That is the present position. We have to change it, and services mode-IV is in our favour. Therefore, we have to negotiate hard and we will negotiate.

The hon. Member, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said that I should not or we should not be a barking dog. I would

say to him that we would be a biting dog. He has also said that I should not or we should not be a paper tiger. I would assure him that we will be the springing tiger and the springing Bengal tiger and fight hard for the interest of the country and for the interest of the nation.

Then coming back to the QRs, I think much has been said in the sense why do we have to remove QRs. If there is no balance of payments problem, we have to remove QRs. This Government did not do it. In 1947, in GATT, we had agreed to that provision. Probably, they thought the balance of payments position might not be comfortable for ever. So, thanks to Dr. Manmohan Singh and his reforms, since 1991 our BoP position was increasing and after 1995 we have a very comfortable level of BoP. What happened was that other countries like Switzerland and Japan started pressing hard. Your position is very comfortable. Why do you not remove Quantitative Restrictions? We negotiated. Bilateral negotiations took place. I think with countries of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Switzerland, European Commission and Japan as a third party, we started this discussion in 1997. In the meanwhile, they have almost agreed to allow us to phase out our QRs by six years, that is, from 1997 to 2003.

What happened was, the USA went to the Dispute Settlement Body. They have not agreed. We went into bilateral dialogue with them. They had put some impossible and humiliating conditions. Therefore, we argued our case in the Dispute-Settlement Body. We lost. Then we appealed. It went to the appellate body. Again we lost. Then, the next step was to go to the arbitrator or again to have bilateral talks with the USA to fix reasonable period of time (RPT). If you go to arbitrator, it will take 17 months. Therefore, we negotiated with the USA and got more than 17 months, that is, about 18 months. So, here is an advantage.

Now, not only that we have been removing Quantitative Restrictions autonomously on our own, but also it is there right from the Congress regime. For example, the total number of tariff lines as on 1-4-1996 is 10,202. The number of tariff lines freed as on 1-4-1996 is 6161. Tariff lines freed for import during 1996-97 was 488. In 1997-98, it was 391; in 1998-99, it was 894; in 1999-2000, it was 714; in 2000-01, it was 715. So, we have removed all Quantitative Restrictions. I think it is not a sin. In fact, we will be happy.

Only four countries are keeping Quantitative Restrictions in the world. I think it is not good to keep on comparing with them. Which are the countries? They are Pakistan, Bangladesh, Tunisia and Sri Lanka. These countries alone in the world are keeping up Quantitative Restrictions because of BoP reason. Even now they are phasing it out. Therefore, we do not want to keep on comparing with them. Therefore, we removed Quantitative Restrictions consciously. Not only that but you may also ask why and what will happen if you keep it. It is because the Dispute-Settlement Body and the appellate body have given orders like that. Not only that, somebody is watching our BoP position. Who is watching? It is WTO. In the WTO, there is a Committee called BoP Committee. They are watching it. Then how will the Committee know? IMF is giving information. Not only that but also we are an open society. Our Economic Reviews and Budgets are read all over the world. There we can see our balance of payments position. Now, I think it has crossed more than 45 billion dollars but we have got safeguards.

As Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said, we have to calibrate the tariff rates. He said, in agriculture, they are not reducing the tariff. In Japan, there is a much more level of tariff. Sir, I want to correct him. In Japan alone, for various kinds of variety of rice, the tariff is not 100 per cent or 200 per cent. It is between 500 per cent and 1000 per cent.

It is much more; it is unimaginable. Therefore, they have agreed to reduce it. We have to negotiate for that.

Even now, we have been calibrating the tariffs and increasing the tariffs. For milk powder, we have increased the tariff from zero per cent to sixty per cent. For poultry meat and chicken legs, the tariff has been increased from 35 per cent to 100 per cent. We have increased the tariff on Spelt (Wheat) from zero per cent to fifty per cent; in respect of rice in the husk brown and broken rice, the tariff increase has been zero per cent to eighty per cent. For semi-milled or wholly milled rice, we have increased the tariff from zero per cent to seventy per cent. For millet, jowar, sorghum and maize, the tariff has been increased to fifty per cent from zero per cent. In respect of arecanut, the tariff has been increased from 35 per cent to 100 per cent; while in respect of apple, it has been increased from 35 per cent to 50 per cent.

In respect of tea, the duty was 15 per cent. We increased it initially to 35 per cent and then increased it to 70 per cent. For coffee, we first raised the duty from 15 per cent to 35 per cent and then to 70 per cent. In the case of sugar, the tariff has been increased to 60 per cent from 27.5 per cent. For wheat, the tariff has been raised from zero per cent to fifty per cent. The tariff for coconut, including desiccated coconut, has been raised from 35 per cent to 70 per cent; for copra, the tariff has been increased to 70 per cent from 35 per cent. For second-hand cars, the tariff has been increased from 35 per cent to 105 per cent. For crude palm oil, tariff has been raised from 25 per cent to 65 per cent; for refined palm oil, it has been increased from 65 per cent to 85 per cent. For other crude vegetable oils except soyabean oil, the tariff has been increased to 75 per cent from 35 per cent. So, it is going on.
...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ADHIR CHODHARY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): Can you increase the tariff beyond the bound rate?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : To go beyond the bound rate, we have to negotiate with other countries but first let us raise it to the bound rate. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Minister, would you require more time?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : I am just about to conclude now.

We have appointed a Committee, which is called 'war room'. They are keenly watching every month. They are receiving information. The inter-ministerial Committee is watching 300 sensitive items. So, if the import level goes up, we will clamp action. You will be surprised to know that our non-oil import levels are negative. So, nothing adverse has happened.

I can assure you that even otherwise a Bill is before the House. If there is a surge, we can temporarily clamp quantitative restrictions. That provision is in the Bill. The Bill is already before the House. It will be examined when the Report is given. Therefore, I would assure the House that no harm would be done because of the removal of QRs.

I would say especially regarding agriculture that those who are having employment opportunities for three per cent to five per cent, as Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar said, are protecting their interests. So, in our country, where more than 70 per cent of the people are employed in agriculture, we have to protect their interests. I would say, not only this Government but any Government would not survive if they do not protect the interests of agriculture. I once again assure you that it is the duty of any Government to protect the interests of agriculture. Otherwise, there would be unrest and revolt. Therefore, I would like to assure the House that we would take constructive and sensitive measures and also re-engineering measures to increase the tariffs if necessary. Negotiations are going on in Geneva. They have agreed to reduce the tariffs. We have to modernise our agriculture. We have to link it up with international methods. ...(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : इस संकल्प पर बढ़ा हुआ समय समाप्त हो रहा है। मैं सदन की अनुमति से इस संकल्प पर पन्द्रह मिनट का समय और बढ़ाता हूं ताकि मंत्री जी अपना उत्तर दे सकें और आगे की प्रक्रिया शुरू हो सके।

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : That is why I have given this assurance.

Usually, it is customary in this House that such Resolutions are withdrawn on the basis of assurances given by the Ministers. The hon. Member has made his points; and all points made by all hon. Members have been taken on board. I have to especially thank my brother Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar for his left-handed compliments.

With these words, I request the hon. Member Shri Sunil Khan to withdraw the Resolution.

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (MUVATTUPUZHA): For palmolein oil, Malaysia is putting pressure on us to decrease the import duty. Though we increased it up to 85 per cent, but, again, it has been decreased.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: We have got refining capacity.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : The problem is that Shri Murasoli Maran's war room is like Osama bin Laden's cave. He has set it up after losing the war.

Now, in the area of edible oil, I plead with you since you have been so tardy that you can go up to 300 per cent for all edible oils other than soyabean oil. In the case of soyabean oil, you can go up to 45 per cent and take into account countervailing duties. Alas, what you have done, what the hon. Prime Minister has done is to try to get Quattrochi from Malaysia and in exchange you have agreed to import so much palmolein oil from there. This is the kind of mismanaged foreign trade policy for political reasons which you should stand up against.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Your points have been noted. But we have reduced some duty on refined crude oil. It is because we have got refining capacity in India. Probably, that may be the reason.

SHRI SUNIL KHAN (DURGAPUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the NDA partners are thumping that Shri Murasoli Maran has won the battle. But it is not like that. We appreciate the resistance put up by the hon. Minister, but why was he not successful in his efforts?

Sir, Doha declaration is a clear gain for the developed capitalist world. It has catered to the needs of global capital in crisis. The Indian view point was that before going in for a fresh round and opening up new issues, the WTO had to examine whether the existing rules and policies, from the Uruguay Round, were fairly implemented or not. They were not implemented.

The developed countries, America and European countries are not following the first Uruguay Round, but we are following. That is why, we have lifted the ban on 1,429 items. As a result, the agricultural sector is in a disaster position because 75 to 80 per cent people are dependent on agriculture. However, you have crushed the agricultural sector.

Sir, one of my dear friends from Kerala has mentioned about some items. Do you know that the price of coconut has declined by Rs. 4 per coconut? What about cashew nut price in Kerala and in other parts of India? What about rubber? Tea industry is facing a serious crisis. What about paddy? The cost of production is increasing. You have lifted subsidy on fertilisers by 15 per cent whereas in other sectors, my dear colleague, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, has elaborately mentioned, regarding the subsidies provided by the European countries. So, if they have subsidised and we have not subsidised, then what will happen?

Sir, I have already spoken elaborately regarding domestic products for example *moori.* Even though in Hindi it is called *Moori* ,in Mumbai, it is called *churmura.* What about our rural sector poor widow mothers who are producing *moori*? The cost of production increased due to increase in the freight charges by two per cent in coal. What about for America and other European countries? They are giving more subsidies in case of food production. They will come with a laminated packet of *moori.* Everybody will take up the laminated packet like *Uncle chips'.* Will the poor mothers be able to compete with the Americans in that market? They will not be able to compete.

So, this is the fate of our agricultural sector. I do not want to go into details. But in the case of Agriculture, you have failed in your round of talks.

Sir, please go through paragraphs 20, 22 and 23 of your statement about Doha. I am not referring to them because it will take some time.

You take the case of small-scale sector. In Karnataka 50 per cent of the small-scale sector is closing down and next year it will be 75 per cent. You take the case of garments. You cannot send your products to America how much you want . But you have lifted the ban here. So, all the garments will come in here. But what will happen to the garments that are produced in Maharashtra and Gujarat? Two lakh fifty thousand people in the unorganised sector are involved in stitching and cutting etc. They are now in a dilapidated condition due to 16 per cent increase of excise duty in garments. All the goods are coming from the foreign sector. I have already spoken on the agricultural sector and the small-scale sector earlier discussion at the time of moving the resolution. But you have not answered the points.

You tried your best that the developing countries are united. It is better. We have to fight unanimously. But what about the decisions taken at the first Uruguay Round? Why are they not implementing it? Why is it that America and other countries are not implementing the decisions of the first round of talks? You are talking of the second round of talks. But they are not implementing the written documents. Here, you are implementing them and you have lifted the ban. Please clarify this point. Why is it that the first-World countries are not implementing the decisions taken in the first round? Why are you so eager? You said the year 2005 will be the destination. That means that the next round of agreement is due in that year. But you have signed it earlier. Why did you do that? I want you to clarify these things.

In case of the drugs, we know that under TRIPS you have made some resistance. In case of life-saving drugs for diseases like AIDS are costlier. You have already closed down our IDPL, our own domestic producer of pharmaceuticals. You have closed it down. All the medicines will come from foreign sector at a higher rate. You clarify this point. How will our patients survive? These are the condition of the small-scale sector.

In your Budget customs duty is already withdrawn on Rs. 2,000 crore and excise duty is already imposed on Rs. 3,200 crore. If our domestic units are closed down, who will give you excise duty of Rs. 3,200 crores? Please clarify on all these points.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sunil Khan, the hon. Minister has already assured the House to protect the Indian interests.

SHRI SUNIL KHAN : Sir, they always assured the House. But the people are in crisis. The farmers of Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh are committing suicide.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please hear me. The hon. Minister has said that he would take all necessary steps to protect the Indian economy also. He has already requested you to withdraw your Resolution. Are you going to withdraw your Resolution or not?

SHRI SUNIL KHAN : No, Sir. I am not withdrawing. I am in favour of the general people, the 100 crore people of India. I am not against these 100 crore people.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So, you are not going to withdraw your Resolution. Then, I am putting it to the vote of the House.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, generally the convention is that the hon. Member withdraws it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : On your behalf I have told him. You also request him.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I would request the hon. Member once again to consider it. It was never done before. I think it is better.

SHRI SUNIL KHAN : No, I am not withdrawing.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sunil Khan, the hon. Minister has also assured to look into all these things.

SHRI SUNIL KHAN : No, Sir. I am not withdrawing. Why should I withdraw? All these small-scale sector units are being closed down. The workers are not getting their salaries. In HSCL salaries for 25 months are due to the employees. How can I withdraw this Resolution?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

> "As the decision to withdraw the quantitative restrictions with effect from 1st April, 2001 will seriously affect Indian economy and result in closure of domestic industries and severe unemployment, this House urges upon the Government to review its decision and to renegotiate the terms of General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) in order to protect the industrial and agricultural sector."

The Resolution was negatived.